

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*One Hundred and First
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1963

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 18, 1963

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Victor Musk of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Tabled and Assigned**

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study the subject matter, Bill "An Act relating to the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act" Legislative Document No. 1355, introduced at the regular session of the 101st Legislature to determine whether the best interests of the State would be served by the adoption of such legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study to the 102nd Legislature (S. P. 572)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read. (On motion of Mr. Wellman of Bangor, tabled pending passage and specially assigned for Thursday, May 2.)

**Senate Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw
Covered by Other Legislation**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Appropriating Money for a Convention Solicitor and Facilities Promotion Specialist, Department of Economic Development" (S. P. 225) (L. D. 720) reporting Leave to Withdraw, as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money to the Department of Economic Development for Additional Space Advertising (S. P. 230) (L. D. 723), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money for Continued Production of

Promotional Films (S. P. 231) (L. D. 724), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money for Special Promotional Materials, Department of Economic Development (S. P. 232) (L. D. 725) as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money for Maine Products Show (S. P. 233) (L. D. 726), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Providing for a Complete Inventory of Recreational Facilities in the State (S. P. 234) (L. D. 727), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Funds for Publications of Geological Maps of Maine (S. P. 235) (L. D. 728), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money for Publication of "Maine Developments" Bulletin (S. P. 236) (L. D. 729), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Increasing Funds for Geological Survey Field Crews (S. P. 237) (L. D. 730), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Money to Provide Assistance to Smaller Towns in Comprehensive Planning" (S. P. 265) (L. D. 779), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Creation of Four Additional Positions in the Department of Economic Development" (S. P. 267) (L. D. 781), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Money to the Department of Economic Development for Increased Industrial Space Advertising (S. P. 268) (L. D. 782), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating

Money for Automobiles for Department of Economic Development (S. P. 270) (L. D. 784), as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and adopted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for the Development of State Parks and the Issuance of not Exceeding Seven Million Three Hundred Thousand Dollars of State of Maine Bonds for the Financing Thereof" (S. P. 93) (L. D. 230)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act Providing Access Roads to Recreational Areas" (S. P. 1) (L. D. 1) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 570) (L. D. 1515) under title of "An Act Providing Access Roads to Ski Areas Open to General Public" and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Quorum of Maine Sardin Council" (S. P. 338) (L. D. 1003)

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities reporting same on Bill "An Act to Update Validation of Street Installations" (S. P. 369) (L. D. 1035)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Amended in Senate Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act to Create Water Conservation Districts and to Expand Powers of Soil Conservation Districts" (S. P. 45) (L. D. 125) reported same in a new draft (S. P. 553) (L. D. 1490) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

In the House, the Report was read. (On motion of Mr. Smith of Bar Harbor, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Thursday, April 25.)

On motion of the gentlewoman from Chelsea, Mrs. Shaw, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Providing for Trademarks under Potato Tax Law" (S. P. 550) (L. D. 1482) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 550, L. D. 1482, Bill, "An Act Providing for Trademarks Under Potato Tax Law."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of that part designated "Sec. 340." and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 340. Rules and regulations; contract. The Maine Potato Commission may prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the pur-

poses of sections 336 to 339, and may issue licenses to shippers or processors who shall enter into a contract with the commission and agree to abide by the rules and regulations. The commission may charge a fee on a per package or per hundredweight basis for the use of trademarks established by the commission or of the State of Maine trademark used on potatoes, fresh or processed. The commission shall reserve the right to cancel any license for failure to abide by the rules and regulations of the commission, or for breach of the terms of any contract entered into with the commission; and the commission shall have the right to cancel all outstanding licenses at any time that the commission deems such action necessary to the best interest of the potato industry as a whole. The commission shall also have the right to grant an exclusive license for the use of such trademarks to a single co-operative which shall, by contract with the commission, be empowered to issue licenses to shippers and processors on such terms and conditions as the commission may require.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Revising Laws Relating to Elevators" (S. P. 181) (L. D. 480) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

In the House, the Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. MacPhail of Owl's Head, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Thursday, April 25.)

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Calais Water District"

(S. P. 165) (L. D. 441) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 165, L. D. 441, Bill, "An Act to Incorporate the Calais Water District."

Amend said Bill in the 5th line of section 1 by inserting after the word "district" the following words 'and persons and corporations without said district'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 6th line of section 2 the words "within said district"

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of section 4 a new paragraph to read as follows:

'This section shall not apply to the exercise of eminent domain pursuant to sections 12 and 13.'

Further amend said Bill in the 11th line of section 7 by striking out the words and punctuation "that act," and inserting in place thereof the following words and punctuation "this act, including obligations to pay created pursuant to sections 12 and 13, and"

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 9th and 10th lines of section 11 and inserting in place thereof the following: 'and to distribute, sell and to contract for the sale and distribution of water to persons and corporations in Milltown, New Brunswick.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 4th line of section 12 the words "the part or"; and by inserting after the word "Company" and before the period in the 10th line the words and punctuation ', wherever located and whether the same or any part thereof be located within said district or in Canada or in another part of the State of Maine'; and by adding at the end of section 12 the following:

'Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, said water district is authorized and empowered, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, only to take all of the plant, properties, franchises, right and privileges, except cash assets and accounts receivable, owned by said company and located in the State of Maine, and not less than all thereof; and moreover said water district shall concurrently with any exercise of such right of eminent domain agree to purchase all the plant, properties, franchises, right and the privileges, except cash assets and accounts receivable, owned by said company and located otherwise than in the State of Maine. If the parties are unable to agree upon a purchase price, for the properties so located otherwise, the court hearing the petition filed pursuant to section 13 shall determine what all said properties located otherwise than in the State of Maine are fairly and equitably worth in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 13; and all procedures set forth in section 13, including the appointment of 3 appraisers to determine said worth and the right of report and appeal, shall apply.

Said district is moreover expressly authorized to purchase and hold all or any part of the common capital stock of said company or any other corporation organized for the purpose of holding and operating water properties within or without the State of Maine.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 11th, 12th and 13th lines of section 13 and inserting in place thereof the following:

'said Calais Water & Power Company and any mortgagee, shall, within 30 days after hearing on said petition, appoint 3 disinterested appraisers, one of whom'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the words "an itemized" in the 3rd line from the end of the first paragraph of section 13 and inserting in place thereof the words 'a reasonable'; and by adding at the end of the first paragraph of section 13 the following sentence:

'The reasonable expenses paid or incurred by said company in producing such books and papers and in filing such matter in the clerk's office as hereinbefore enumerated shall be borne by said water district.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the first sentence of the 3rd paragraph of section 13 and inserting in place thereof the following sentence:

'The appraisers so appointed shall, after notice and hearing, fix the valuation of all of the plant, properties, franchises, and rights and privileges, other than cash assets and accounts receivable, of said company, including such of same as are located otherwise than in the State of Maine if the parties are unable to agree upon the purchase price therefor, pursuant to section 12, at what they are fairly and equitably worth, so that said company shall receive just compensation for all of the same; and, in case there is any severance of any of the properties of the company, wherever located, said appraisers shall award any severance damage.'

Further amend said Bill in the 7th line of the 3rd paragraph of section 13 by inserting after the word "interest" the words 'at the rate of 6 percent per year'; and by inserting after the words "water district" in the 8th and 9th lines the punctuation and words ', and all expenses accruing thereafter shall be charged against said water district'

Further amend said Bill in the 18th line of the 3rd paragraph of section 13 by striking out the word "may" and inserting in place thereof the following words and punctuation 'shall, on motion of either party,'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the first 2 lines of the last paragraph of section 13 and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Upon confirmation of said report, which may be modified by the court so sitting, and confirmed as so modified, the court so sitting shall thereupon, after hearing, make final decree upon the entire'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th sentences of the last paragraph of section 13 and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Except as otherwise provided by this act, the procedure before the court and justice thereof shall be as in civil actions, and report and appeal to the law court shall likewise be as in civil actions.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 6th line of section 15 the word "waived" and inserting in place thereof the word 'incurred'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 29th line of the last paragraph of section 13 the words "the amount so determined" and inserting in place thereof the word 'judgment'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Commissioner of Labor and Industry" (S. P. 302) (L. D. 875) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House, the Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Smith of Strong, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 23.)

Divided Report Tabled until Later in Today's Session

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Continuing Use of State Aid and Town Road Improvement Funds" (S. P. 386) (L. D. 1089)

Report was signed by the following members:
Messrs. COLE of Waldo

FERGUSON of Oxford

BROWN of Hancock

— of the Senate.

Messrs. DRAKE of Bath

ROSS of Brownville

CROCKETT of Freeport

DENBOW of Lubec

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TURNER of Auburn

NADEAU of Biddeford

CARTER of Etna

— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Drake.

Mr. DRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until May 2.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, moves that item 24 be tabled until Thursday, May 2, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Drake, to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

Thereupon, on a viva voce vote, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until one week from today.

Thereupon, on a viva voce vote, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until next Tuesday.

Mr. Dudley of Enfield then requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, moves that item 24 be tabled until Tuesday next pending the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Drake, to accept the Majority Report. A division has been requested.

All those in favor of tabling item 24 until Tuesday next, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-three having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: I would like to ask you to vote on that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The motion has been disposed of.

Mr. TURNER: I move that we lay this on the table until later in today's session.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, now moves that item 24 be tabled until later in today's session. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Reports and Bill were so tabled pending the motion of Mr. Drake of Bath to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Operation of Retail Store and Restaurant Prior to Application to Sell Malt Liquor" (H. P. 826) (L. D. 1213) on which the House accepted Report "B" of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on April 9.

Came from the Senate with Report "A" reporting "Ought to pass" accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacGregor, moves that the House recede and concur in accepting Report "A" on item 25. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: I move that we adhere and ask for a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER: The motion of precedence is that the House recede in accepting Report "A."

Mr. Childs of Portland then requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of receding and concurring with the Senate on accepting Report "A," please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, this matter is now before the House for debate as I understand it? The motion before the House now is to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER: No, the House has already receded in adopting Report "A." The question before the House now is the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHILDS: Is this matter open for debate now?

The SPEAKER: It is debatable whether the bill shall be read or not.

Mr. CHILDS: I would like to speak on the merits of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed in debating the merits of the bill.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: May I first say that I do not consider this bill as a wet and dry bill. As you undoubtedly know that this bill is a bill which would prohibit and no longer require that people who have

stores and so forth, who are new proprietors, would no longer need the ninety-day waiting period which is the present law. I realize that this is somewhat of a hardship on our larger stores who have been in business for some time and now want a malt beverage license or they are stores of renowned names and long standings in the area. But what concerns me about it is the effect that it is going to have on some of our small towns. You have a lot of your neighborhood stores in your small towns who are open year-round and the major part of their business or a good percentage of their business is selling malt beverages. Changing this law would mean that when the summer season starts, people who do not live in this state would be able to easily come to the State of Maine, open up a store in a small town and be able to sell beer, which would have a great impact on the people who have been in business for years in these small towns. I feel that in fairness to our neighborhood stores and to our stores in small towns and communities who are open year-round, that this business should not be taken away from them and given to somebody who will come in from out-of-state, stay open for the three or four months during the summer and then leave the state again. So, therefore, if I am in order, I would like to make a motion now that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the Bill and Reports be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham then requested a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can see why my colleague from Portland, Mr. Childs, could feel the possibility of the bill having effect upon the resort areas, I believe that is what he has reference to, and in the fact that it is a possibility that a fly-by-night might come into

the state, set up business for three months and disappear again. However, I invite Mr. Childs and all other members of the House to busy themselves and study the regulations set forth by the Commission, the Commission being the authority and the power that decides on all applications for malt liquor sales. These regulations are very specific, and they, in turn, are ruled upon entirely by the Commission before license is issued, and it is the prerogative of the Commission to make decision as to whether or not the applicant is duly qualified. This being the case, I can see no fear of why the Commission would arbitrarily accept a fly-by-night operator attempting to come in and disturb our local businesses. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to answer the gentleman when he makes a point that the Commission would be determining the qualifications. I feel quite sure that if the Commission outlawed or ruled against an out-of-stater only because he was from out-of-state that that matter would be upset by the Courts. I believe the Commission could determine qualifications if he is qualified as far as the layout of the store is concerned, if he is qualified that he has the right amount of groceries, and the right amount of food, etc. But I do not believe that the Commission could in itself determine that a resident or a non-resident should be a qualification. Therefore, I do not believe the gentleman's argument is valid.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that item 25, Bill "An Act relating to Operation of Retail Store and Restaurant Prior to Application to Sell Malt Liquor," House Paper 826, Legislative Document 1213, and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed, and a division has been requested.

All those in favor of indefinite postponement, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy-eight having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Orders

Mr. Tyndale of Kennebunkport presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study the subject matter, Bill: An Act Relating to Admission to Kindergarten and Grade One in the Public Schools, Legislative Document No. 273, introduced at the regular session of the 101st Legislature to determine whether the best interests of the State would be served by the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study to the 102nd Legislature. (H. P. 1056)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Dennett of Kittery presented the following Order and moved its passage:

Whereas, on Wednesday, April 17, 1963, the members of the 101st Legislature were conducted on an official visit of the Telstar Base at Andover; and

Whereas, the tour proved to be a most exciting one, both instructional and informative, and of great value to the members of the Legislature; therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the 101st Legislature extend to Representative E. Louise Lincoln its sincere appreciation for her role in arranging the visit to the Telstar Base and express to her its conclusion of a job well done. (H. P. 1057) (Applause)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Cookson of Glenburn, it was

ORDERED, that Rodney Ross, Jr. of Brownville and Thomas Poole of Milo be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The SPEAKER: Will the Sergeant-at-Arms retire to the rear of the Hall of the House and conduct Rodney Ross, Jr., and Thomas Poole to their positions as Honorary Pages for the day. Rodney Ross, Jr., is the son of Representative Ross of Brownville. (Applause)

Thereupon, Rodney Ross, Jr., and Thomas Poole were escorted to the well of the Hall of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms to serve as Honorary Pages for the day.

On motion of Mr. Watkins of Windham, it was

ORDERED, that Eric Dunn of Duxbury, Massachusetts, be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

The SPEAKER: The Sergeant-at-Arms will retire to the rear of the Hall of the House and conduct Eric Dunn to his position as Honorary Page for the day. This is the grandson of Representative Dunn of Denmark. (Applause)

Thereupon, Eric Dunn was escorted to the well of the Hall of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms to serve as Honorary Page for the day.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY: With the reference to the Order presented yesterday by the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, which was, on my motion, tabled pending reproduction and distribution, a new order has been prepared and I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday where this was ordered to be reproduced and distributed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby we voted that House Joint Order Relative to the Legislative Research Committee to Study the Problem of Air Pollution within the State, House Paper 1052, be reproduced yesterday. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY: I move this matter be—

The SPEAKER: For the information of the House, all the House has done in its action is reconsider the action whereby it was ordered that this Order be reproduced. It is a specially assigned Order and will come off the table in its time of assignment.

The SPEAKER: The Speaker at this time is very pleased to recognize a group of seven 4-H Club Members from Bath, accompanied by Mrs. Colby and Mrs. Marble. These are the special guests of Representatives Drake and Brewer of Bath.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you young folks a warm and cordial welcome and we trust that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here this morning. (Applause)

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Gilbert from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Beverages in Returnable Bottles" (H. P. 65) (L. D. 89), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this bill heard before the Legal Affairs Committee I thought had merit. I was unable to change one man's thinking on that committee, and because of that, I am not going to try and change anyone today. If we, as a legislature, are not enough concerned to do something about the bottles along our highways, then I am not going to stand here and try to argue you into doing something that apparently you don't want to do. But I should think that if you have travelled at all into the State of Maine in the last three or four weeks, you would realize that there is a problem that confronts us, a litter problem, a disgraceful problem. You cannot travel a mile on Maine highways without seeing bottles strewn all over the place. They are a menace to the highways. They are some-

thing of an obstruction to every person that's driving and yet the Committee reported it out unanimous ought not to pass. This bill is only an attempt to make it possible for children, and apparently children do enjoy going around and picking up bottles and getting the two cents or so that they can get from them, picking them up and doing a service to the State of Maine.

This bill as it was recommended to committee was not an attempt in any way to force a dry issue over on a legislature as some thought it was. It was not an attempt in any way to force any minority view on anyone except only to take care of a litter problem. We figured that litter problem could not be taken care of by fining people. You could raise the litter fine to a thousand dollars and you would still have people throwing these bottles out, but if you could make it possible for young people to pick them up along the highways, then we would know that most of those bottles would be picked up. We would be very happy if all beverages were sold in tin cans. While they may look bad laying beside the highway, yet they would not be the nuisance to drivers that a bottle is; or if all of this could be sold in plastic containers, but due to the fact that our powers to be have not seen fit to sell these wholly in tin cans or plastic containers but in glass bottles, we felt that those glass bottles should be made returnable. But because we could not convince one single member of the committee to go along with us, I move the acceptance of this committee report.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Wellman from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Authorizing Governor and Council to Regulate Exits in Certain Buildings" (H. P. 784) (L. D. 1137) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1054) (L. D. 1527) under title of "An Act Authorizing Insurance Commissioner

to Regulate Exits in Certain Buildings” and that it “Ought to pass” Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire to any member of the Legal Affairs Committee as to the particular reason that there is no grandfather or savings clause in this particular legislative document.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Legal Affairs Committee as to whether there’s any grandfather clause attached or conditioned under this bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Portland, there is no need for a grandfather clause. All this does, as I remember it—I don’t have the bill in front of me, as I remember it, it authorizes him to draw up codes and have hearings. I don’t get the intent of the gentleman’s question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move this lie upon the table and be assigned for tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Mrs. Shaw from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill “An Act Providing for Loans by York County” (H. P. 515) (L. D. 717) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 1520) under title of “An Act Authorizing County Commissioners for York County to Make a Loan for Courthouse Addition” and that it “Ought to pass”

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

**Divided Report
Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting “Ought not to pass” on Bill “An Act to

Revise the Electrician Licensing Law” (H. P. 380) (L. D. 555)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. STITHAM of Somerset
Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
Mr. ATHERTON of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Mr. COTE of Lewiston
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Messrs. FOSTER of Mechanic Falls
COPE of Portland
BOISSONNEAU

— of Westbrook
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting “Ought to pass” as amended by Committee Amendment “A” submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WELLMAN of Bangor
GILBERT of Eddington
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Philbrick of Augusta, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Thursday, April 25.)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill “An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Litter” (H. P. 743) (L. D. 1072) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1055) (L. D. 1522) under same title and that it “Ought to pass”

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
Messrs. STITHAM of Somerset
ATHERTON of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Messrs. WELLMAN of Bangor
FOSTER of Mechanic Falls
GILBERT of Eddington
BOISSONNEAU

— of Westbrook
COPE of Portland
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting “Ought not to pass” on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. COTE of Lewiston
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the Special Order of the Day assigned for ten o'clock this morning on page seven of your House Advance Journal and Calendar.

The following matter by unanimous consent was made a special order of the day for Thursday, April 18, 1963 at 10:00 A.M.:

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965." (S. P. 540) (L. D. 1481)

Pending — Third Reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the members of the House that the amendments to this bill were not presented to the Clerk's office until 8:30 this morning, and they have done the best they can to get them before you. Does every member have the amendments on their desks?

(Cries of "No")

The SPEAKER: Now the Chair will recess the House for fifteen minutes, giving you time to enable yourselves to be familiar with the amendments before you. We will convene in fifteen minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, I would urge all the Democrats to meet in the Legal Affairs room so we can study these amendments and caucus.

The SPEAKER: The House is at recess.

After Recess

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer House Amendment "D" to L. D. 1481 and move its adoption. I would like to speak on the amendment.

House Amendment "D" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "D" to S. P. 549, L. D. 1481, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965."

Amend said Bill by decreasing the total appropriation for each of the following departments, institutions, agencies and others by 6 percent.

Adjutant General, Department of Agriculture, Department of Apprenticeship Council
 Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission
 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
 Attorney General, Department of Audit, Department of Banks and Banking, Department of Baxter State Park Commission
 Boxing Commission
 Charitable Institutions
 Civil Defense and Public Safety
 Contributions and Transfers to Other Funds
 Debt Retirement
 Economic Development, Department of Education, Department of Executive Department
 Finance and Administration, Department of Fisheries and Game, Department of Forestry, Department of G. A. R. Department of Maine Harness Horse Racing Commission
 Health and Welfare, Department of Historian, State
 Industrial Accident Commission
 Insurance, Department of Interest on Bonds
 Interstate Cooperation, Commission on
 Knox Memorial Association
 Labor and Industry
 Legislative
 Library, State of Maine
 Liquor Hearing Examiner
 Maine Historical Society
 Maine Maritime Academy
 Maine Port Authority

Mental Health and Corrections, Department of
 Park Commission, State
 Personnel, Department of
 Police, State
 Public Utilities Commission
 Relocating Facilities on Federal Aid Highways
 Running Horse Racing Commission
 Sea and Shore Fisheries
 Secretary of State
 Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts
 Treasurer of State
 Uniform Legislation, Commission of
 University of Maine
 Veterans Affairs, Division of
 Water Improvement Commission

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A few days ago we had a debate in here on limiting the salaries of certain department heads, putting those under the jurisdiction of the legislature. The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth said that in his opinion the Governor of this state had on the whole been parsimonious in granting salary increases.

Mr. BERRY of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of correction.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may offer his correction.

Mr. BERRY: I did not make such a statement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, may proceed.

Mr. MacLEOD: May I say that the word "parsimonious" was used in the debate. After that debate I was thirsty and went out to get a drink of water and I met a friend of mine who had gone to Harvard, so I asked him what parsimonious meant. He said: "It means stingy, stupid." And I said, "Do you mean to say?" He says "No I don't mean to say that. The word means stingy and you are stupid." Well perhaps the Executive Council and the Governor have been parsimonious in the salary increases that they have

been granting, but the document 1481 could not be called parsimonious by any stretch of imagination.

Let us just for a moment examine some of the figures that are in this document as compared with two years ago. Two years ago this legislature was asked to support the appropriation of \$119,000,000 in the current services budget. This year we are presented with a document that calls for the expenditures of 143 millions of dollars. This is our current services budget for this year. This represents an increase of \$24,000,000 in a two-year period in the current services budget. This is a twenty percent increase. If we project this same type of a budget to two years from now, the current services budget will be approximately \$171,000,000, using this as a base for a twenty percent increase; and in 1967 it will be over two hundred thousands of dollars.

Now, I have been called irresponsible; I have been called an obstructionist; I have been called a slasher. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, a document that is presented to run the current services of this government that exceeds the revenues of this government by twelve and a quarter million dollars approximately, I call irresponsible. It is very difficult for us here to do the job that should be done and do it right. Part of this job should have been done by the Executive Department before this was ever presented to us. Some more of this job should have been done by the Appropriations Committee. Now the Appropriations Committee says they couldn't change this budget, and yet I have talked individually with four separate members of that Appropriations Committee. One told me just yesterday that there was a large sum of money in the current services budget that rightfully belonged in the supplemental budget, and I said "then where is it?" He says, "I can't tell you." Another member of the Appropriations Committee told me three or four days ago that there was nine or ten million dollars in the current services budget that could be removed, and could be removed without sacrificing much in the way of state services.

Gentlemen and ladies, it is an old axiom of politics that the politicians are always behind the people; that the people want the changes before the politicians can sense the need for the change. So I maintain in this State of Maine that there's a situation exists today, the people want the change and we are too slow to recognize it.

A few weeks ago I made some remarks before this House concerning economy. These are some of the letters that I got within the next few days after those remarks. People don't write letters in praise to politicians. People write letters when they want to criticize and people write letters when they want something for themselves, but you don't get many letters of praise. Out of all the letters I received, there was only one letter that took any issue with my remarks, and these letters ranged from farmers in Aroostook County to an ex-governor of this state and to an ex-department head. Let me quote from the ex-department head's letter. "I was head of a department in Augusta for several years and well know how some of these budgets are blown up. A pruning knife intelligently used could help the deficit situation. The ex-governor of this state, who was one of the most respected governors that we have had in the last two decades said roughly the same thing.

Now let's go to specifics in the departments. We have an institution, Stevens Training Center, with less than 100 inmates and 28 house mothers. We have the Central Maine Sanatorium with 77 patients as of last month; 120 some odd employees, 26 of whom are in the kitchen, cooks, dishwashers and food service attendants for 77 patients. These are two examples. Go up to the Women's Reformatory. They have 40 or 41 inmates, and they have 40 or 41 employees. Twenty-two of these employees are called matrons. I assume they are something like a guard. We have 22 matrons guarding 40 women. And yet we have the State Prison at Thomaston, run by Warden Robbins and less than 90 people. He takes care of pretty nearly 500 inmates which run from murderers, rapists and

what have you. Something is wrong in those situations.

We have an Aid to Dependent Children program in this state which has become a mockery and a disgrace the length and breadth of this state and you people know it. The State of Maine in its Aid to Dependent Children program, because of the heavy matching moneys from the Federal Government and the cities and towns that contribute 18 per cent whether they want to or not, as an official policy really is encouraging immorality in subsidizing the illegitimacy that results. I have right here a document taken from the Department of Health and Welfare, their own memo stolen by a member of the Welfare Committee over the objection of Dean Fisher, listing 650 cases with an unrelated male in the home, and these people are all on ADC. And I think you all know what they mean by an unrelated male.

Now this amendment calls for reduction in the entire current services budget of six percent across the board. This will amount to somewhere around nine million dollars. This is a meat axe approach. This isn't sound slashing. This would be slashing if we did this. But what I am appealing to the members of this House this morning, what I am going to appeal to you on is this: pass this amendment calling for a nine million dollar reduction in the current services budget, pass it today, and I will pledge to you that a motion will be made to then recommit the bill and amendment as amended to the Appropriations Committee and let them cut it where they will, but with the instructions to take the six percent. I recognize fully you can't cut six percent off some of these departments without hurting, and hurting where you shouldn't be hurting.

Now a lot of pressure individually and collectively if we pass this this morning will be put on the individual members of this House. It will come from the front office. It will come from the Senate. It will come from other House members. You all have your own bills which you would like to have passed. Maybe a few of us have jobs that we may want from the state. But you

know, you only go this way once. It is a one-way street and it is a short one. So let's go with dignity and courage. From the moment of our birth, we start to die a little bit.

So what is it—whether we are here on the threshold of our lives such as the gentleman from Wiscasset and the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, or whether we are at the midpoint of our lives or approaching it as I am, or whether we are in the twilight years as some of the gentlemen in this House are, we only go this way once.

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken on this motion, let's have it by the yeas and the nays because I have infinite faith in the intelligence, the integrity and the courage of the members of this House. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman move the yeas and nays?

Mr. MacLEOD: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Fal-mouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

As House Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, it is my responsibility to explain L. D. 411, which, as you all know, is the so-called Current Services Budget.

You all are entitled to know the changes that the Appropriations Committee has made during these long weeks of public hearings, conferences with department heads, study, discussions, debates and executive sessions.

I hope to be able to explain in detail each and every change that our committee has made in this very important measure which controls all of state government for the next two years.

However, before I explain these items, I'd like to make it very plain that it was the intent of your Appropriations Committee to not only hold the line on the cost of state government, but to reduce expenditures wherever possible. We feel we have accomplished both goals.

There was some thought given to curtailment of present state services. . .but we realized, as we know

that you will, that all present state government programs are in effect only after approval of the Legislature. And, that to arbitrarily cut these existing programs could mean serious results to many segments of the state population.

Even beyond this, however, would be the effect on our own communities that now plan, program and rely on present state subsidies and programs. We did not feel that we could coldly throw back onto the towns and cities some or parts of programs and grants now assumed by the state. Consideration of current state services by our committee and this Legislature involves tremendous responsibilities which all of us recognize.

Let me shift my emphasis now in another direction to what some of you have described as an uncontrollable growth in state government and in the number of employees on the state payroll. Your Appropriations Committee felt that it should continue the so-called bracket system, implemented two years ago by the 100th Legislature. So, in the preamble to this measure, we retained this feature and all permanent positions are in parentheses, based on needs, and no new permanent positions can be created without the approval of the Legislature. Not even the Governor and Executive Council can create new, permanent jobs under this preamble.

But this year we have gone one step further. The system installed by the 100th Session has worked out well, but there has been one area that needed strengthening and we believe we have done it. In simple language, there have been department heads who have been unable to fill hard-to-employ positions and who, at the close of each fiscal year, have used these funds to hire temporary or project workers. They then have come to us and said, "We used all our Personal Services money last year so now we've got to have more." This we want to stop and this, the strengthened preamble, prevents it.

Under the provisions of the preamble, each department head would be required to gain the approval of

the Personnel Board, the Department of Finance and Administration and, finally, the Governor and Executive Council. Then, and only then could they hire the extra or temporary help which they must prove they need, even though they might have the funds available.

Now, I'm going one step ahead of a motion that will be made to amend this preamble and briefly reveal to you that we have added another restriction. Our Committee approves the Merit System applied to all state employees. We favor the granting of merit pay increases when they are merited. But, we do not look kindly on granting merit pay increases automatically.

With this in mind, we have had drafted an amendment which sets out in no uncertain terms the intent of this Legislature in the awarding of these merit increases. Job evaluation forms will have to be used or applied to each employee being considered for raises, and only those who qualify on the basis of merit are to receive them.

Now, does this new, strengthened, amended preamble indicate a lack of interest on the part of your Committee to effect year 'round economy? I say it demonstrates clearly our intent, and that the State's financial picture two years from now will reflect this intent in the form of dollars and cents added to Surplus.

Now let's turn to the items in the Budget that have been changed. First, the increases that we have proposed:

We added \$200 in each year of the biennium, under the "All Other" category, to Baxter State Park because the size of the park has been increased by some 6,000 acres through a recent outright gift.

We added \$31,512 the first year of the biennium and \$32,104, plus \$1,000 under "All Other," to the State Prison budget, under the Department of Mental Health and Corrections. We will be needing eight new guards to staff the new south wing at the prison, a wing that will be completed before the end of the biennium.

The Secretary of State's office now has a serious shortage in cleri-

cal help, so we have provided an extra \$998 for the next two years to alleviate this situation.

United States postal rates are up, as you all know. The office of the State Treasurer, with its huge mailing, has been given an additional \$6,185 in "All Other" category for this purpose for the next two years, \$3,342 in the first year, and \$2,843 in the second.

Next, I'll shift to the decreases or "cuts" that we are proposing, which I'm sure will be of prime interest to all of you.

Readjustments within the Bureau of Purchases have resulted in the saving of \$1,000, decreases of \$1,577 for the biennium, which are offset by increases of \$577; the net: \$1,000.

We have decreased the budget of the Division of Child Services in the Department of Health and Welfare by \$24,699 the first year of the biennium and \$25,701 the second, all under Personal Services, plus another \$3,750 for "All Other" travel expense. This totals \$57,900. We would be eliminating a present program, whereby social workers must be on a stand-by basis during divorce actions in six of the State's Superior Courts. This would leave the services of these social workers at the discretion of the presiding Justices, who would determine their need and request their services.

The original estimate on bond interest for Educational Television was set at three to three-and-a-half percent. Recent more favorable bond markets have reduced this to between 2.55 and 2.60 per cent, so here we have taken out a total of \$21,375 for the next two years.

Our next decrease already has received considerable publicity and you all undoubtedly are aware of it. I'm referring to the discontinuation of the Military and Naval Children's Home at Bath, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Mental Health and Corrections. The amounts involved are \$49,543 the first year of the biennium and \$54,300 the second for personal services; \$17,131 the first year and \$18,418 the second in the "All Other" category; \$750 and \$500 for

capital expenditures. The overall total, \$140,642.

To wrap up the differences in totals of increases and decreases, we added \$73,200 to the Governor's original Current Services Budget requests, but decreased it by \$220,934.

The grand total then would read a reduction of \$147,744 from that requested by the Governor. However—just to confuse you a little, this so-called grand total is offset by income from the Military and Naval Children's Home of \$14,585, mainly meals paid for by the staff, so that we now end up with a net total in decreases of \$133,159.

I could conclude my presentation now, but I'm sure that some of you may be asking why we didn't think more in the area of the Department of Economic Development, which has been so widely discussed in these halls and throughout the State Capitol. The very fact that the DED continues to be a topic of discussion explains why we felt that we should not recommend any moves other than the budget as offered by the Governor.

There may be other areas that we could have outlined, but our feeling was that the Supplemental Budget requests will form vehicles with which to institute such changes as you may want to make.

I have purposely waited until the conclusion of my remarks to give you one more bit of more pleasant news. The Forestry Department, for several years, has had an account known as Aid to Towns for Forest Fires. From this account, we have transferred \$121,737 into Unappropriated Surplus. And, under the Department of Mental Health and Corrections Institutional Reserve Fund, we have transferred \$72,358 into Unappropriated Surplus.

Finally, with the closing of the Military Naval Children's Home, another \$29,400 that would have gone into capital construction would be saved, so that, too, is marked for Unappropriated Surplus.

This all means that we have added to Unappropriated Surplus \$223,495 for use in capital construction at the discretion of this Legislature or for application to the special LD's and Resolves with price tags

that so many of you have introduced this session.

I could add together the decreases in the Current Services Budget together with the funds which we say should go into Unappropriated Surplus and come up with a grand total figure of approximately \$356,654 as the gain which we feel we have made in the best interests of the people of the State of Maine.

I have been lengthy, I know. But, more important, I hope that I have been helpful and clear in describing for you the increases, the decreases and various changes and recommendations made by your Appropriations Committee. My thanks to all of you for being so attentive and courteous.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: For the past few months we have approached the problem of the budget and the consequential effect it might bring on any needed increase of revenue. I have prepared a little document which you see in front of me in answer to the various questions that might be brought up in regard to the budget question in front of you today. I would ask you one question in your mind. What this amendment means? Now in essence, what is asked in this amendment is to decrease the budget by 6 per cent across the board. In other words, they are challenging the efforts of our Appropriations Committee who have worked diligently and hard during the past several months in the performance of their work in presenting to you a logical budget. We might also say in this one particular instance that it is very easy to say, let's cut the budget 6 per cent across the board and let's see what they will do. That is what you are doing here, you are hamstringing the Appropriations Department. You are setting them to work all over again on a very, very nebulous approach. There have been some specific recommendations made here, let's cut the Stevens Training School. They have too many

employees. How many of you in the House have visited this home? Well, I did and I want to tell you that there is one of the finest institutions we have in this state, and conducted under the leadership of one of the finest ladies in that particular type of work.

Let us consider another point. Nothing is said here as to what has been accomplished. All that has been said is, let's cut; needlessly, without any specific recommendations as to why these cuts should be made. I like a logical approach to any question, and I believe and heartily concur with everything that our esteemed chairman of this Appropriations Committee has said. Because if you will look over that Committee, they are a scattering of conservative and progressive men and women who have looked very challengingly at every bit of this budget.

Also let us think in another term of the progress of the state. Nothing was said about the progress of the state. The only thing that has been said, let's be static; let's not go forward, let's cut; let's move back a few paces. The Department of Education in the last several years has made some terrific strides in the progress of the education of our children. And other departments in area of education and vocational rehabilitation, the same strides have been made. What is your intent, gentlemen? A responsibility has been charged to you to do two things, to conservantly operate the state and to make progress. These two things can run parallel, but they must be done on a logical basis.

I would ask this group here that are submitting these amendments today, what is the basis? Have you visited each institution? Have you examined the budget carefully? The figures look broad; let's cut. Gentlemen, this is a very, very nebulous approach. I am not going to belabor this debate any longer. I ask you to indefinitely postpone this on the basis that it is not logical nor does it have any type of approach other than a nebulous view that the budget looks large.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand the gentleman moves

indefinite postponement of House Amendment "D"?

Mr. TYNDALE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First I would like to talk on the amendment supporting the gentleman's motion, Mr. Tyndale.

I would like to briefly go over this with you to indicate to you that it might well be labled a hasty-pudding amendment. If you will look at the amendment, you come to the debt retirement. I would like to ask the proponents how they intend to bring about a six per cent saving on the debt retirement when we are committed by law to this obligation. Also, the same thing would pertain wherein it concerns the interest on bonds. Again we are committed by law. Let's come to the Fish and Game proposal, fixed figures, we're committed there on a basis of dedicated revenue.

While I am on my feet, I would like to quote to you some figures—that were not docketed together hastily, but with extreme care. I will have these reproduced later so you can have them for future reference. The cost of the L.D.'s, presently in motion by this Legislature wherein it involves the General Fund Current Revenues, Emergencies, \$408,000. For the year 63-64; \$113,950,000, I am using round figures, and for 64-65, \$92,000,000. Also wherein it concerns the general fund unappropriated surplus, emergencies, \$1,290,000. 63-64, \$12,000,000; 64-65 \$1,416,000; wherein it concerns Governor Reed's Supplemental Budget request, 63-64, \$3,056,000; 64-65, \$2,394,000; wherein it concerns the special appropriations table, Senate measures on the table in the Senate, 62-63, \$10,000; 63-64, \$513,000; 64-65, \$270,000, for a total of \$793,000; and bear in mind that only two of these are bills or resolves that were heard by the Appropriations Committee.

Wherein it concerns L.D.'s, heard before the Appropriations Committee involving the General Fund Current Revenues, emergencies, \$408,000. 63-64, \$85,000,000; 64-65, \$87,000-

000, for a total of \$173,077,000. Wherein it concerns L.D.'s, heard before the Appropriations Committee involving the general fund surplus, emergencies, \$1,282,000; 63-64, \$12,000,000; 64-65, \$1,437,000 for a total of \$14,805,000. Wherein it involves bond issues in motion, the total of \$61,859,000 which brings us to a grand total of \$474,748,997.22. Now if you heard carefully the remarks of the gentle lady from Falmouth, the House Appropriations Chairman, and if you heard carefully these figures here, I would say that the Appropriations, not hastily, but very carefully, very seriously, is doing a fairly good service in reporting so to you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel that it is imperative for someone in this House to stand on his feet and support the principle which has been put forth by my colleague from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod. We are faced today in the State of Maine with one of the greatest financial crises in this long history of our state. I believe that this grave fiscal problem has not been born overnight; it has been thrust on us through many administrations back through the 1960's, back through the 1950's, years in which, in my opinion, through the inability and ineptness of planning in foreseeing the future, our state has been led down a path which has led us to money problems which we obviously face today. I hold to certain philosophies of government, of a strong capitalistic government and democratic government, a system which can provide a stable, but moderately progressive approach, an approach to those activities which government is forced into by the people to which that government is subordinate.

In my opinion, we have too long followed a pattern set by leaders of other states and of our national government, a pattern of government by agency, government by department, or one by the executive. I believe that it is high time

that the people of the State of Maine through the elected representatives here today join forces, rise and topple this system. We are now faced, as has many past legislatures of this state, with accepting or perhaps having crammed down our throats as the people's representatives, a program which reeks with departmentalism, which is full of duplication of services and effort, and frankly one which is very slowly but surely going to swallow up our whole system of government in a mass of bureaucracy.

Those of us who have made a sincere and honest effort to prevent this wholesale fiscal slaughter of a system of government which men and women before us have fought wars to protect, we are now being called obstructionists or being called irresponsible, and we are threatened ladies and gentlemen of the House, with being kept in session not through the month of May or even June, but kept here until we do just what is wanted of us, rubber-stamping a program and being dictated to by the hands and feet of the body of the people, those people who are now elected in our government.

The moderate progression of government, or by and for the people, as I see it, is based on two basic premises. One, we must hold spending for programs that are now in existence within our present needs unless some form of emergency presents itself. More basically and with very few exceptions, our increase in expenditures must not exceed our increase in revenue from the present tax base and the present tax rate. Unless we do this, legislature after legislature will convene at Augusta and be faced with budget problems such as are facing us here today and, in effect, be asked to promote and accept the deficit financing of current programs.

The second premise. If there are to be any new programs or any extensions or expansions of existing programs beyond the rate of growth dictated by the increase in revenue from existing sources at existing rates, or if there are any

new programs or new capital constructions which will in effect increase our current expenditures required in the future, these must be justified on two bases. First the need of the program, that that program or extension of the program have merit. And second, that that demand for the program or the extension be shown by those to whom the bill for this program must be presented. I feel this requires a vote of the people of the state, either on the program or on the tax increase which is necessary. I hold to the view that this is not a radical or new approach. We do this in our town meetings. We should be doing this here in the legislature today. If we, as members of the Legislature, accepted the responsibility of representing the people, we would be carrying out and meeting the requirements as I have outlined; but in fact, this is not the case. What we do do is appear here at Augusta and are immediately presented with Must Legislation, legislation which emanates directly from the departments of government with little or no thought to the collective impact on the people but claiming always that the program or services are essential to the well-being of the state, that the people demand them and that consequently we, those same people, must pay the bill. I urge each of you as responsible legislators to either put an end or attempt to put an end at this session to this form of automated government. It is high time that the dog wagged the tail rather than the tail wagging the dog.

Current services provided for by the 100th Legislature had an approximate price tag of one-hundred nineteen million dollars. Our current services budget now is about \$143,000,000 — some 20.2 per cent increase in a two-year span. If we were to add to the current services budget of two years ago, the entire supplemental budget of some \$6,300,000 and the additional appropriation bill which is perennially passed here the last night of the session, we would still be faced with some seventeen or eighteen millions of dollars more to finance the same program at this session. If we ac-

cept the program, that is the demands of the people as it has been interpreted by those in other branches of our government, those people who I believe are farthest from the man on the street, we are faced with being coerced to accept a thirty-three and one-third per cent increase in our major source of revenue, the sales tax.

May I ask each one of you to consider, consider well, what this will do to the State. Not the tax increase itself, but this acceptance of a system of automation as it were, concerning the necessity if we adopt the programs today presented. The necessity of coming back here two years hence and buying through necessity another major increase in taxation, either from a new tax source or a major increase in the rates of taxes on the present base.

I am sure that if you face this problem realistically, you will recognize the necessity that is going to be with us two years from now. I believe that we are all certain that with proper effort, there could be effective, substantial savings in the government of this state without seriously affecting the services to the people who have created our government and at whose sufferance our government continues. This, however, cannot be easily accomplished without a maximum effort of those who represent that they have in their possession the inner knowledge of the problem. To those outside the Legislature and even to those in the Legislature who hold the knowledge of areas in which savings can be effected, but for one reason or another, perhaps valid to them, are unwilling to come forward with those savings, I believe we should return this matter. I believe that we should return it for their consideration.

I felt at first that this was not possible because we would merely be given back a picture painted with perhaps a little different view, one which would be aimed at appeasing some of the members in this House who are sincerely interested in the economical and efficient operation of government. It is for this reason, or it was for this reason, that

is the futility of attempting to express our dissatisfaction with the present current services budget as a whole, and requesting those with a session-long background in this field, many of whom I suspect could assist essentially in this area, the futility of returning it to them to reevaluate this tremendous fiscal problem and then return to us with a budget which would be with in the means that we now have available. It is because of this futility feeling that I have, that I had intended to support the amendment proposed by Representative MacLeod, which in effect is and would effect a substantial savings in expenditures.

If it were to appear, however, that we could receive indication from those whose knowledge perhaps surpasses ours in the field, that a recommitment would be favorably accepted for the sole purpose of effecting substantial reductions in spending, I would favor such a recommitment. If not, then ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think it only fair to serve notice at this time that I will be on my feet and oppose passage by the two-thirds majority necessary for this bill to be enacted and that I will oppose with all the vigor that I have the passage or the enactment by a two-thirds vote of the major increase in tax revenue to finance this program of spending.

There is one other thing that I would like to point out. That it is very often said that any general attack made on spending in government, any conservative approach, comes from those who sit in this hall for the first time as elected representatives of the people. Freshmen so to speak. I think in looking back over past sessions of those of you who have been here and those of you who are familiar with this problem, this is true. I would venture a guess that the reason is that the people who are sitting here for the first time as representatives, just a few months ago, were the people back home who the heads of departments and the various agencies of our government say are the people that are demanding

these services. Actually, these new members of our House are the closest of all to the problem, the closest to the people. Because they were these same people who were said to be demanding the services. This is what I recognize to be the reason why the so-called new blood in the Legislature always seems to be the forerunners of any attempt to stall this already gigantic machine from being so unwieldy financially that one day it will topple us into a system of government where the people no longer have the power we now possess under our democratic process.

To those to whom I have talked concerning this subject, I have said that I am opposed and I do not desire to become a party to irresponsible cuts in our budget for the next biennium. Many of these same individuals, however, to whom I have talked, have indicated that cuts could be made, in services, in programs and in personnel, and not seriously affect the state's business for the next two years. And it was for this reason that I intended to support Representative McLeod and the amendment.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would move that with reference to legislative document 1481 that the Bill be recommitted to the joint committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with the following instructions: That Bill An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965, Senate Paper 549, Legislative Document 1481, be reported back to this Legislature with an overall net reduction in expenditures for the following biennium of six percent. I would hope that my motion would receive passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request under Rule 38 that the gentleman reduce his motion to writing that it may be placed before the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the motion made to recommit did not include all accompanying papers and in

view of the fact also that we have before us an amendment up against this measure, I contend that this motion is not a proper motion. We must dispose of the amendment first. It has been presented. It must be either passed or not passed, but it must be disposed of first.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would call attention to Rule 29 to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that a motion to recommit has precedence over an amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: May I ask a parliamentary question of the Chair whether such instructions are germane to the motion?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will read the motion. The motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, moved with reference to L.D. 1481 that the Bill be recommitted to the joint committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with the following instructions: That Bill An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965, Senate 549, Legislative Document 1481, be reported back to this Legislature with an overall net reduction in expenditures for the following biennium of six percent. The motion is in order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, we have a motion before us, the motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment, and we must dispose of this motion first.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that a motion to recommit, even though a motion has been made to adopt an amendment, has precedence over the motion of adoption.

Mr. JALBERT: I will accept that, but now will you tell me if we did recommit the bill, what happens to this motion? When are you going to dispose of this motion? Will you read me that rule, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has posed a parliamentary question and it is in order. Under the motion, if this bill is recommitted

to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, they are, under their instructions, to report it out with the 6% reduction at their discretion.

Mr. JALBERT: That doesn't answer my question at all.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise this time?

Mr. JALBERT: I rise because my question was not answered.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman pose his question once more.

Mr. JALBERT: The question is: if this bill would be recommitted, if it were, when it comes back to the Floor of the House, what then is the procedure? The question is, when are we going to dispose of this motion? I am aware of the fact that the motion to recommit takes precedence, but I want to know what happens to this motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment, and I want it read from the rules, Mr. Speaker, this time, and not from up here.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. I think it is very clear to any member of the House under Rule 29, the motions of precedence that are posed to this assembly are: to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question, to commit, to postpone to a day certain, to amend, and to postpone indefinitely. And they in their order have precedence, so the motion to adopt an amendment does not have precedence over a motion to recommit.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: In order for the Speaker to entertain the motion for the previous question, he must have the expressed desire of one-third of the members present. All those who are in favor of entertaining the previous question, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made the count.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed on a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PLANTE: Is the main motion the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease?

The SPEAKER: The main question is the passage to be engrossed. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will please rise and remain standing until they can be counted.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, less than one-third having arisen, the motion to entertain the previous question does not prevail.

Now the question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, and the Chair will read it to the House: "That the bill be recommitted to the Joint Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with the following instructions: that Bill 'An Act to Appropriate Money for the Expenditures of States Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965' be reported back to this Legislature with an overall net reduction in expenditures for the following biennium of 6%."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I assume that this is debatable, this recommitting?

The SPEAKER: It is debatable.

Mr. DUDLEY: Well I think it would take me, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, about one hour to express my feelings, but seeing as I believe I couldn't keep your attention for one whole hour, I will try to be very brief.

First I would like to say that I concur, to shorten my remarks, that I concur 100 per cent with the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, to Amendment "D" filing H-266 and his remarks. This, I concur with. I think that he has been one of the greatest Legislators in this House and has so expressed himself this morning.

Now only one point that I would like to make, and being very brief, is that I hope that every Member of this House understands that the passage of this measure very definitely means an increase in some major tax; quite possibly an increase of 33 per cent in the Maine sales tax. To this I am opposed also, and I know that this morning is when we decide the issue actu-

ally. If we accept this morning this current services as is, there is no alternative except to vote for the sales tax.

Now I would like to tell you what the sales tax does in my little area that I represent. In the Town of Lincoln, Maine, which is a relatively small town, in 1962 paid into this State Treasurer \$181,360. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a lot of money for a small town. Now they received back in school subsidies approximately \$10,000. Now these are the people that I represent, they don't believe that we can spend money here enough to make prosperity in Lincoln, or any other place. They don't believe that they can lift themselves by their bootstraps either, and that is what we are trying to do, we're trying to make these people believe that they can be lifted by their bootstraps, they don't believe that either.

Now some mention has been made here of freshmen Members of this House. I think they have expressed a lot of courage and I am all with them, and I am not a freshman Member, I have been around here quite a little while. Now the increase in this appropriation, bear in mind, is \$24,000,000.—million dollars. That's a lot of money where I come from, and I wouldn't want any of these people that are presenting these figures to be running my business, I can tell you that right now, and I think today I would like to ask my friends, if I have any in this House, please go along with the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod and the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, and I think they have put us on the right track. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have no ambition to belabor this issue and I certainly do not want to prolong this debate to any great extent, but I rise in support of the motion made by the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease. This might seem to many as a drastic move, but I think that this is a time for drastic action. Budgets as they have been appearing in the State

of Maine, are greater and greater each year, each biennium. They will ultimately reach the point where they will transcend all reason and they will be utterly beyond the ability of the people of the State of Maine to pay the bill without the entire confiscation of their means of subsistence. I truly believe that this budget can in some manner be cut to a reasonable amount, and I certainly think that this is the time and the place to do it; and therefore, I submit to you that I support 100 per cent the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the question that we are now trying to decide, the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, moved the indefinite postponement of this amendment. Now does that not take precedence over recommitment?

The SPEAKER: It does not under Rule 9. Will the membership please restrain their emotions. This is a very important measure, and everyone will be recognized and given an opportunity to speak.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, I raise the point somewhat along the line of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman. I believe that the motion to indefinitely postpone applies to the amendment. The motion to recommit applies to the bill, and I share the opinion that the matter before us is the indefinite postponement of the amendment. These two are not in precedence on the same question.

The SPEAKER: For the information of the membership, we are considering the main question, and that is passage to be engrossed. Therefore, we are moving to recommit the bill. The amendment is not pertinent to the main question at this time. A motion to table is in order.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. JALBERT: For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: In sharing the views, Mr. Speaker, of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman, and the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry, I still go one step further. I want to ask how we are —

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman arguing with the Chair or does he wish to make an inquiry?

Mr. JALBERT: I want to ask what happens to the motion to indefinitely postpone, and I want that phase of the rules read to me from the book.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is out of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to speak to the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale. However, I will confine my remarks to the motion now before us.

We are discussing a current services budget. Everybody knows that. I hardly needed to make that statement, and it is just that. These are services which previous Legislators through the requests of people back home have established. It goes back to the last session, to the session before the last session, and the session before that. They are set up, many of them, by law. Granted, we can refuse to appropriate money, but do we know how these people feel now? Would it not have been a better approach if we had wished to provide a less subsidy to the cities and towns on education to have come in with a bill to amend that thing down? This is the amount that by actions of past Legislatures they expected they were going to be provided with.

And again to get to the present motion, this to me seems a very mandatory thing to this committee. This committee has carefully considered this current services budget. This puts this committee in a very difficult spot, it would appear to me. I hardly know now how we would approach it. We could make it across the board,

but it seems to me that it is mandatory. We could make 20% somewhere else, so I think you should carefully consider what you are doing before you send this bill back to the Appropriations Committee. Consider that these things are services that have been provided over the years. Our departments are set up to take care of the services that the people have asked for previously, and they are now established. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, to recommit does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterboro, Mr. Bradeen.

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Time marches on and it is not my purpose to consume too much of the substance that life is made of. About the first present that I had when I became a Member of the 101st Legislature was a red-covered volume. I mentioned at that time that that would probably prove to be the most expensive paperback that the people of this State would read this year. I have had no occasion to change my mind about that.

I find as I look through the budget, that its effect on me is something the same as certain schedules in the Sinclair Act, and the latest or almost any edition of the Congressional Record. The more I read, the more I hear about it, the more I am confused. Perhaps the proper word is frustrated. Now it is not my intent on this occasion to go into the content of the current services budget. That has been and undoubtedly will be explored satisfactorily.

I do however, propose to tell you people a short story. It has a moral. It is about three bears, but it is not the nursery rhyme. And I beg the indulgence of my friends, the retreads of the 100th Legislature, because they have heard this story before.

Some ten or a dozen years ago the Chrysler Corporation sponsored a series of ads, colored ads, in magazines of nation-wide cir-

ulation in our land. I recall one in particular that points a moral, and certainly deserves your careful thoughts when you vote on this bill. The picture that I have in mind, one of a series, undoubtedly came from the Madison Avenue gentleman whose business it is to win friends and influence people, for those who employ them. It showed this mother bear standing in a fast-running mountain stream. The water was running down over the rocks and the sun was shining on the rocks, and on the bank were two cubs. Mother bear reaches down into the cold water and throws a fish upon the bank for the cubs' breakfast. The picture had a title. I commend it to you. The title was: "We aim to take care of our own." My friends, your budget, in my judgment, I am not on the committee, represents the most careful thought and work from conscientious, dedicated, hard-working, competent people, who I fully believe work on the premise that we aim to take care of our own. I fail to see how, how the matter can be improved in any way by recommitting it for further study. We have certain obligations which we must discharge to the one million people that we represent in the Maine House of Representatives. It is our responsibility to discharge those obligations honestly and to the best of our ability. I believe that we all aim to take care of our own, and I shall be deeply disappointed if the motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations and Finance does prevail. I thank you for your close attention.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You all know how I feel about the proposed amendments and appropriations of the various departments. There are many here that are much more fluent than I on their feet, and I don't want to belabor the question. I simply rise in support of the motion of my good friend, Mr. Pease, from Wiscasset.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk be kind enough to read the gentleman's order from Wiscasset once again?

The motion of Mr. Pease of Wiscasset was read again by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I then inquire, does this motion mean that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs will be confined to 6%, or may they make reductions where they think it is possible, or do they have to use the magic number 6%?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman poses a question through the Chair and the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, may answer if he chooses.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can answer the question, but I would be perfectly happy to withdraw it and make another motion and indicate not less than 6%. I would withdraw my motion and now move that with reference to L. D. 1481 the bill be recommitted to the Joint Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with the following instructions: That Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965, Senate Paper 540, L. D. 1481, be reported back to this Legislature with an overall net reduction in expenditures for the following biennium of not less than 6%, and I ask for a roll call vote on this motion when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair under Rule 38 will ask that this motion be reduced to writing and presented to the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members: I find part of the highway program was placed on our desks this morning, and on

looking it over I find I am directly involved in that to the extent of sixteen towns. I suppose I am involved to that extent in this.

Now it must be remembered that each taxpayer in Maine has to be respected. When we know that the continual increase in state expenditures means dollars out of their pockets from taxes, it also means less dollars for their daily, weekly, monthly and yearly necessities. Now my people have made it very clear to me, situated as they are, they do not want or need an increase in the sales tax. Now the sales tax is directly involved in this current services budget, and unless we can cut that either by 6%, which I figure would be a moderate cut, I am sure that lots of the departments could stand very much more, why I would be in favor of Mr. Pease's motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, I have a very esteemed regard for my friend, Mr. Pease, from Wiscasset, and I listened very intently to his discussion of the current services budget. During the past two weeks the leadership in the House has urged the members of this group that they could make their specific amendments where specific cuts could be made. This is in front of you this morning, nine amendments, carefully prepared, and I know with dedication in their hearts, to the economy of the State of Maine; but here is what you are doing if you accept this motion. You are sending it back to the Appropriations Committee, you are lengthening the session at a great cost to the State of Maine. Now I say this in answer to one statement he makes, the substantial cuts that can be made. This statement must have been made with a tongue in his cheek, because the amendments before you, the nine amendments, are not substantial, but amount to very small amounts and cuts in various departments, not over a couple of million dollars, and they in turn have some question to them. The thing I would like to bring out at this time, I think

that we are not only charged with economy, but we are charged with the needs of our people. That is in the preamble of your Constitution, and these things that have accrued over a great many years are now what we are reckoned to pay for, is the progress of our various departments. I have a tremendous lot of faith in this Appropriations Committee, and I know to what extent they studied this bill.

Gentlemen, we have given them their opportunity; we have asked them to present their specific cuts, and these substantial cuts I know cannot be made unless you lessen the services to the needs of the people of the State of Maine. I have heard that remark made several times in my town, and people have answered the question to me. I have not answered it for them, when they say to me: I don't want any more increase in taxes. Gentlemen, I don't want any more increase in taxes, and I don't think there is anybody in the State of Maine wants any more increase in taxes. However, we are charged with the responsibility to furnish certain services to these people, and if you will ask any one of them whether they have need of these services, you will find very few that have not.

For instance, an example, we have 20,000 retarded children in the State of Maine, and we are taking care of 1530 of them. I ask you gentlemen, are we meeting our responsibility? Don't we have to meet the responsibility of educating our children? Of taking care of our aged or maimed? And if you will examine right down the line where they say we don't need taxes, are the very people that are asking these services and are demanding of them, and I am furnishing them to them as a State Representative.

Last session I fought with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Waterboro, Mr. Bradeen, and other members of the delegation, against a rise in the sales tax. We knew that that responsibility was going to come back at us. If you leave a house go in disrepair over a period of years, there comes

a day of reckoning. Gentlemen, we are faced with a responsibility in this session right now. The time has come, and I would say to you to keep and bear in your minds that there was not one single soul in this House who did not have economy in his mind when he started the session. Up to this moment, out of careful study, where are the substantial cuts? Look over your amendments. Are you going to charge this committee to go in and spend days and weeks and weeks and weeks of finding where they can cut the services for the needs of the people? Gentlemen, it just doesn't make sense. I don't want to be classed as one of the last big spenders, and I certainly am not, because I do believe in sound fiscal policy, and I believe in essence in this budget you have sound fiscal policy; and I certainly urge that you will defeat the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, said that what you have in this budget today is sound fiscal policy. This requires a 33-1/3% increase in our major revenue—producing tax into our general fund. Every bit of this is going to be spent this biennium. What do we do two years from now? This is sound fiscal policy. So there may be no misunderstanding, I rise in complete support of the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease. It has been said it is too late. It is not too late. We have today, Thursday, April 18, 1963 to do what we wish with this budget. Now is the time, and here in this House of Representatives is the place, and we are the people to do it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Drake.

Mr. DRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, and also to try and offset a trend which has reached the

climax here in this House this morning.

I have sought election to this House for one reason—to do what I can to better the economic welfare of my state and to consider, work for, and vote for legislative programs with this goal in mind. I am not one of those who feels that a negative, regressive approach will make a better Maine. I am not one of those who believes that we must cut back to go ahead. On the contrary, I honestly believe that to have progress, we must make progress. No industry can expand by cutting its staff. No business can forge ahead by trimming its product. No development can prosper and grow without promoting itself.

To repeat myself, I sincerely want to better our economic welfare, and I cannot subscribe to the approaches that have been under way these past two or three weeks to weaken, to drastically cut back, to eliminate well thought-out programs designed to bring progress for our people and to our state.

I had the good fortune in the 100th Legislature to serve on the Appropriations Committee. I know first-hand, then, of the work, sweat, study, time and thought required to satisfactorily write the budget under which our state government operates for two years. Yet, what has happened this year? First, the Governor spelled out his general program in his Inaugural Address. Then, a week later, he spelled it out in projects and dollars and cents. This was followed with a presentation to all of us of the most expensive paperback. Once the Appropriations Committee began to function, it called each and every state department before it. Each and every budget was scrutinized in detail.

I ask you, how many of those who today want to tear these budgets apart were present at these hearings? How many took either the time or had the interest to ask questions at that time or find out the answers themselves from those persons directly responsible? You

know the answers. No one! Now, individuals who overnight have become state government experts, financial experts and wizards in the operations of all kinds of state programs step forward and say: follow my lead, here is where we can cut and cut and cut. Now these individuals choose to ignore the fact that the people of Maine voted for educational television and say: here is a place we can cut; or in effect, they say what do we care what the people voted for. Now these individuals say to you and to me, we can force the growth in state government to a sliding halt. Just cut everything 6%. They say to you and me, the growth in costs that affects everyone else, must not apply to state government — it cannot apply to state government, because we say so.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I feel compelled to make the comment "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and I think you can easily understand my point.

I accept the word of our Governor when he says to us that he gave state government operations, costs and programs, a thorough going-over before presenting his budget to us. I accept the word of the Appropriations Committee that the current services budget "ought to pass" with one exception, I might say, as they referred it out. And finally, I accept almost as a fact that this House and you, my colleagues, have the wisdom and foresight to recognize the dangers involved in trying to hold down our state government and its program at a time when progress should be our most important product. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that we all are well aware of the fact that this current services budget and a major tax go hand-in-hand, and I also think that we are well aware of the fact that for the Members of the House to sit here and try to cut this current services budget by amendments would not

be feasible nor would it be practical. We are well aware of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs are the ones that heard the evidence. And also I believe that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs are now somewhat aware of the feeling of this House; and the feeling of this House, from my observation, and also the feeling from many of our citizens, is that the people at this time are opposed to an increase in our taxation or opposed to a major increase in taxation.

I cannot possibly believe that this committee could not take back this L. D. and give it more consideration and possibly find some cuts and therefore I shall concur with the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, and hope that this matter is recommitted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee.

Mr. HENDBEE: Mr. Speaker, this measure has been ably debated on both sides, and I am sure that the ones who have spoken previous to me are much more fluent than what I ever will be, but there is one item in this proposed cut to which I take a very great dislike. I will mention Civilian Defense. Very few people in this country pay very little attention to Civilian Defense, and what it means or what it could mean. Now I would like for you ladies and gentlemen of the House, to back-track with me for a few years when I found myself in London in 1941, 1942 and saw the Battle of Britain at its height; where I saw people, women and men, out working in the streets, on the roofs, wherever they were asked to go, hastily organized, doing a wonderful job, people who did not know, or never will know, the meaning of the word defeat.

Here in our Country our Civilian Defense setup in the various towns and throughout our state and nation are striving hard to have the people understand that this sort of thing might happen again. God forbid, ladies and gentlemen, that it ever does to a country like ours. I have seen all the killings that I want to see in my day and age, but I will simply tell you that a

cut of the kind that has been offered for our Civilian Defense would cause that budget to stand twice to make a shadow. I cannot understand how they could take so much money away, or attempt to, from something that is so meaningful. In this day and age, ladies and gentlemen, we know not what might happen, and it might happen overnight; and where would we go and what would we do if it did?

I had the rare privilege, possibly, if you may call it that, of walking around Hiroshima five days after the bomb had been dropped there. I saw that town or small city obliterated. People were wiped off the face of the earth in large numbers because they knew not what to do. They didn't know this was coming, and it came in a hurry.

Now if we start to cut away our Civilian Defense and have nothing to operate on but a token force, we would be in a very, very bad spot if something like that should happen to us.

Now in the Town that I live in, we have taken over a floor of the mill. We have a complete hospital unit there. We have generators and everything that is necessary, operating room, the equipment, we have cots, blankets and equipment to take care of many thousands of people. In case of disaster striking, we are supposed to take care of the people who are evacuated from the City of Revere, Massachusetts. The veterans' organizations in our town have gone along with our Civilian Defense Director and we have been apportioned jobs to which we will be called if the time comes.

Now I would say to you ladies and gentlemen that we know not what we may be called on to do. I was a member of the disaster squad in Watertown, Massachusetts in 1943. We were called out one evening with eleven blasts on the fire whistle and we went down and we were told to report to the Coconut Grove, and we worked there all evening, ladies and gentlemen. I wiped the blood of many people from my hands, and burned flesh and cloth, and things of that type, because we were an or-

ganized group. We knew just where to go and what to do when we got there, and I appeal to you ladies and gentlemen to try to stand by the original budget for our Civilian Defense because it is a very important thing. You never need a raincoat, ladies and gentlemen, but it is a mighty handy thing if it rains. You don't go around wearing it every time, but it is nice to have when you need it; and that is just exactly the way I feel about Civilian Defense setup in the State of Maine. I am proud to be a member of it and I shall support it in everything that I can do to keep it in its entirety, so that we might protect the people if and when it is necessary. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to remind the House that every town and city that you represent has based their school budget on a 100% subsidy. If we attempt to cut the present current services budget, your towns will suffer, and they will not receive the money they expect. If I remember my figures correctly, unless we appropriate another seven and one-half million dollars, your towns and my town will receive not 100% of their expected subsidy, but 79.7%.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. This budget represents services voted by previous State Legislatures. I do not feel that this motion is the right approach, and urge you to vote against the motion. I am in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Easton.

Mr. EASTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise largely to ask a question of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease or anyone else who would care to answer it, and that is, under the wording of the pro-

posed recommittal order, whether or not the 6% minimum cut is mandatory on the Appropriations Committee or whether the Appropriations Committee may in its wisdom, come back with a 2% cut, a 4% cut or no cut at all?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Easton, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would attempt to answer the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Easton. The motion as it is made would be mandatory on the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee to reduce the overall total. It is not an across-the-board cut, it is an overall total reduction of at least 6%. I would remind—or I would further answer the question by indicating that there is a strong possibility that this may not be acceptable and some compromise may have to be reached through committees of conference and so forth.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to highly support the remarks made by my good colleague, Mr. Hendsbee, from Madison, on the matter of cutting the Civilian Defense budget. That is an area in which we cannot afford to cut. It is an area that we have to maintain and sustain. I heartily concur with his remarks. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Jameson.

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: For three years over the radio and the TV I have asked the people, any of them, to write to me, call me and let me know what services they demand. Every paper you picked up at the beginning of this session there was something about the services the people demanded. Who are they? I can tell you in a very few words who are these people who are demanding these services, and they care little or nothing for the taxpayer, it is the

heads of your departments, nobody else. I have never had anybody come to me or call me on the phone or anything else and tell me any particular service they wanted, only to vote against some bill.

The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, mentioned that a million dollars was a lot of money up in his country. It's a lot of money anywhere. I don't think there is a person in this building or I don't know as there is a person born who can count one million one-dollar bills in 365 days. Does that give you some idea of the magnitude of a million dollars? Yet the budget calls for \$143,000,000. I wouldn't go along with it. I would suggest a 12 per cent cut right across the board. I think it is time, myself, that we took one step right here in this Legislature, the 101st, to stop this spending and curtail that thirty-three and one third per cent increase in the sales tax. I most heartily support the gentlemen Mr. Pease and Mr. MacLeod.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Young.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First I want to say that I am not an expert or a wizard in figures and affairs of the state government, but I was here in the 99th Legislature and I was here in the 100th and they told us the same story that we had to have an awful lot more money than we had the previous year. In the 99th it wasn't a large sum at that time, it was around \$4,000,000 that they had to have to balance the budget, and they had to have trade-in on automobiles — that was the major tax, and we didn't go along with that. We passed a little bill on transient rentals, and it didn't bring in more than \$300,000 or so, but everybody was happy, the state government functioned just the same and when we got all through we had a surplus and in the 100th Legislature they wanted something like, oh, \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 more, so they said we had to have the sales tax, an increase in the sales tax or else everything would go haywire. Well we argued here for a great deal of time, and finally they found some money in different places, so

that they got it down to where we had to have a half a cent or we possibly couldn't balance the budget; but we didn't, we didn't raise the half a cent. When we got all through there was still a surplus and everybody was happy. Now we come in here and they want about \$18,000,000 more, and they say we have got to have the sales tax for that, but I can't see — I think if they hunt around a little more they can find some of that.

And as far as knowing what a million dollars looks like, I don't even have the slightest idea, but I do know that \$143,000,000 is much larger than \$119,000,000, and as far as the school subsidy is concerned for a great many years we have gone and only got 85, 90 or 95% of our subsidy and I think that the towns would live just the same, and if they had to do it, as Mr. Dudley, the gentleman from Enfield pointed out a while ago, his town or one of his towns would have to send \$60,000 back to the state if the sales tax was put on, and they would get back \$10,000. I don't think that is very good figuring. I can figure better than that myself, and I concur with the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope we will shortly conclude this debate, but before we end, I would like to point out one thing. By and large the appropriations which you now have before you in the current services are appropriations by law. If you asked the Appropriations Committee — if you recommit to the Appropriations Committee, and you say cut, that means that they are not going to provide the money as required by statute. Well what statute are you going to tell them not to go along with? This just doesn't make sense. I hope that this motion is defeated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I could

speak to you on each of these items that are in this amendment or will be if this budget is referred back to us. The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, called to your attention some of the rather odd things that would be in it. I will call another one to your attention, the bankers and banking of which a greater part of that budget is paid by the banks themselves. Now this means that in these areas of these departments where some of this is paid as mentioned or we are, as in debt retirement, forced by law to comply with, it will mean a heavier cut in some other department. I do not believe that the Members of this House who think seriously at all, believe there can be a 6 percent cut made in this budget. But I do think that you, as Members of this House, will have to judge for yourselves the quality and the experience of the members of this Committee, their honesty and their forthrightness with you. I would remind you that this is the first time in twenty years that the Governor's Budget has been cut in current services. I assure you that if we take this back to our committee we could come out with as many as ten different reports. When we brought out the ten different reports, I am sure that most of you would not agree with any of the ten. You have had indications of it already this morning where several people have noted that they would not go along with certain cuts.

It has been questioned as to whether we have had the ability and done the job of cutting this budget. I would remind you that those who would have it cut have not themselves shown that they have the ability to cut it, and all of the information that has been available to us has been available to them, and I have talked with many of them, though not telling them as they have stated that it could be done. I would remind you that now that they cannot do it, they would ask us to do the impossible.

I would further tell you that if you cut 6% you may well be cutting 18 percent. I could not give you

the exact amount, but much of this money will have to be cut in matching funds. Some of it is matched three to one; some of it matched two to one; some of it matched fifty-fifty. This is quite a decision. I think you should face up to the issue and decide this in this House today and not recommit it to our Committee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this matter, but when the reflection is cast on some Member of this House that they haven't the ability to think seriously just because they have the desire to do a little trimming, I think someone should stand in their defense.

I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease. I appreciate the courage of men such as the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod and the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease. I came to this Legislature two years ago to, the 100th Legislature, supposing that voices such as these had long since died; supposing that we were in the trend that no one dared to speak against, and it has been very encouraging and refreshing to me this morning to know that we still had men that dared to stand on their feet and voice their opinions along this line.

This budget of ours that is being presented to us today represents a 20 percent increase in two years. All that is being asked is that it be cut 6%. We would still have a 14% increase over last year's budget. Where is the law that states that we must maintain this current services budget and not dare decrease it any more than 6%? Who is there of us that would dare to say that such men would dare do this and maintain this are not thinking seriously?

What about the people back home? Many of them who have very little of this world's goods and they are looking to us for leadership. Where do they stand in this picture? Many years ago when our government in Maine was

formed, there were three branches of government. Today it seems to me that there is a fourth branch, and this fourth branch of government has very little concern for those little people back home. This fourth branch of government pours money down ratholes freely without any concern for what the other three branches under our Constitution care about. This fourth branch of government are our department heads, a bureaucracy. A bureaucracy that has sat here this morning and listened to this debate while their pay is still going on and they ought to be on their jobs. A bureaucracy that has very little concern for what we think here on the Floor of this House or in the Senate.

My friends, if nothing is done about this recommitment motion today, then I feel definitely that we have established something that the future can never, or will never in many years, ever reverse. It matters not to me whether these bureaucrats ask for \$143,000,000 or \$300,000,000. I can never in clear conscience vote for any more sales tax than we already have.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I am very much perturbed at the talk that my good friend from Strong just made. I am much concerned because first which did not concern me, he stood up because somebody had insinuated that they didn't think, but before he finished he goes on to call the dedicated people who serve our state as intent on turning our tax money down ratholes. I wish to apologize for him.

I would like to just say a few words about this appropriation which we have. I have been a member of this august body, this is the sixth time, and I have never asked for, although I think I could have had it, to be a member of the Appropriations Committee, and why I did not ask for it was because it requires so much time, so much effort, that I didn't feel that I had the time, with the business I had to do back home to make a living, to take that responsibility upon myself. But I

have scrutinized each time, each and every time of the six sessions that I have been here their work, and I can say this in all sincerity that I approve very much and am very happy that the State of Maine has had the men and the women in the past twelve years that have been so honest, so sincere and so mindful of the taxpayer. I too am a taxpayer. My taxes in my home town are over \$1,000 and that doesn't take in gasoline tax and some \$700-odd goes for schools, and yet I have no one in school, but I thank God that I am able to get this sort of money to help educate our children, and I would remind you ladies and gentlemen that unless you do something for schools that your taxation on your property is going to soar. Right in my town we are going to lose \$8,000,000. I have a schedule here which you can all look over and you can see what you are all going to lose unless something is done.

Now something has to be done. I might tell you a few things I have got from education since I have been a member of that committee for four years. Two years ago I was concerned about the money that was spent for education in the State of Maine, so I made a survey, and I found that the State of Maine was spending, and that took in the state college at Orono, it took in all the colleges for teachers, it took in every dollar that was spent by the municipalities and by the state for education, and it was rising \$52,000,000. I also went down to my good friend down in Hallowell and found out what we spent for alcoholic beverages, and I found that we were spending rising \$58,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, and that didn't consider the amount sold in the military places because the federal government handles that, and I say to you ladies and gentlemen, that we are not near so poor as we think we are. We are not nearly so bad off if we can spend some \$60,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, I am not afraid of the sales tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust.

Mr. RUST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, to recommit this bill back to the Appropriations Committee. The motion as made this morning to recommit instructs this committee to cut not less than \$9,000,000 from the budget. Now that may seem like a lot of money to some of you and to some others it may not seem like a lot, but where is the \$9,000,000 cut going to come from? If you will look down through the lists of departments mentioned on the House Amendment, you will find four major departments that have most of the money that is in the budget. The Department of Education, where we get our school subsidy money for the cities and towns, and where our teachers colleges get their money. You have the Department of Health and Welfare, where you have a great deal of state money matching a lot more of federal money. Any cuts in this department would certainly cripple that program. The next department that has a lot of money is the Mental Health and Corrections. Those are our state hospitals and our prisons. The other department that gets a lot of money in the budget is the University of Maine. Now I don't think anybody here that is sound thinking this morning is seriously interested in reducing these budgets.

Thus, the question this morning when you get through with the oratory and the debate is a very simple one, if you vote to recommit this bill to the Committee with the instructions to cut \$9,000,000 from the budget, you in my opinion, are voting to reduce the appropriations in these four key state departments as the result of which you will cripple many of the programs and you will have to discontinue many of the others. So the question this morning is not simply cutting the budget, it is a question of crippling state services in important areas of government and discontinuing others, and I hope the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Watkins.

Mr. WATKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Ten years ago, that is five sessions ago, the legislature appropriated approximately \$75,000,000. Today we are asked to buy \$143,000,000. That is nearly double in ten years. If the increase in the next ten years is in the same amount, we will raise \$220,000,000, and if we double what we are being asked for today, it will be \$286,000,000.

We still have in this state about 960,000 people, and I question that ten years from now that we will have more than a million. And if this is true, then in ten years we will have a maximum sales tax, whatever it may be, an income tax, a lottery and federal aid to everything. I support the motion of Mr. Pease.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel that if the recommitment of this Legislative Document was so voted by a majority of the House today, that for all practical purposes, it would never reach the Appropriations Committee, for the Senate would have to take concurring action and agree with us. If we are to be practical politicians, we can readily realize that they will move to insist on their former action, and then the House will move to insist on its former action, and at that time, we will insist on a Committee of Conference. So what you are voting for this morning is to give another reappraisal of the current services budget. If you vote for recommitment, in fact what you are doing, is voting for another look-see at the current services budget by a Committee of Conference consisting of Members for the House and for the Senate. This, in all practical purposes, is what you would be doing.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Easton.

Mr. EASTON: Mr. Speaker, I feel that before we vote, I am re-

quired to explain my vote, and I do so with great unhappiness. I don't propose to be a spendthrift. I sincerely believe that throughout many of our departments, particularly in Personnel, there is a tremendous amount of waste and general profligacy. I cannot in conscience support this motion, for the sole reason that it is a little bit like during income tax time telling your lawyer to make out your income tax and be sure and save you at least 6% over what you paid last year. If he does this, you might be in trouble. Maybe he can save you 20%; maybe he can't save you any. If we were dealing with a motion to recommit alone, I would heartily support it. This is not, unfortunately, the situation. With great regret I will be unable to support my good friend and colleague from Wiscasset.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, that the bill be recommitted to the Joint Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with the following instructions. That Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," Legislative Document 1481, be reported back to this Legislature with an overall net reduction in expenditures for the following biennium of not less than 6%. A roll call vote has been requested, and for the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present rising in support of such a motion.

Thereupon, more than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of recommitment of this matter will answer "yes" when their name is called; those opposed to recommitment will answer "no" when their names are called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Anderson, Ellsworth; Anderson, Orono; Baldic, Bedard, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Birt,

Boissonneau, Bourgoin, Brown, Fairfield; Burns, Bussiere, Chapman, Childs, Cookson, Cope, Crockett, Crommett, Dennett, Dudley, Dunn, Finley, Foster, Gallant, Gifford, Giroux, Hammond, Harrington, Jamason, Jewell, Karkos, Laughton, Lebel, Levesque, Linnekin, MacGregor, MacLeod, McGee, Nadeau, Norton, O'Leary, Osgood, Pease, Philbrick, Pitts, Poirier, Prince, Oakfield; Reynolds, Roberts, Roy, Sahagian, Scott, Smith, Strong; Susi, Townsend, Treworgy, Turner, Viles, Waterman, Watkins, Williams, Wood, Young.

NAY—Albair, Ayoob, Benson, Berry, Blouin, Boothby, Bradeen, Bragdon, Brewer, Brown, So. Portland; Carter, Cartier, Choate, Cote, Cottrell, Coulthard, Cressey, Curtis, Dostie, Drake, Easton, Edwards, Ewer, Gilbert, Gill, Gustafson, Hanson, Hardy, Hawkes, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Henry, Humphrey, Hutchins, Jalbert, Jobin, Jones, Kilroy, Knight, Libby, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lowery, MacPhail, Maddox, Mathieson, Meisner, Mendes, Minsky, Mower, Oakes, Oberg, Osborn, Pierce, Plante, Prince, Harpswell; Rand, Rankin, Richardson, Ricker, Ross, Augusta; Ross, Brownville; Rust, Shaw, Smith, Bar Harbor; Smith, Falmouth; Snow, Taylor, Thaunum, Thornton, Tyndale, Vaughn, Wade, Waltz, Ward, Welch, Wellman, White, Guilford; Whitney, Wight, Presque Isle.

ABSENT—Davis, Denbow, Hobbs, Kent, Noel, Tardiff.

Yes, 64; No, 80; Absent, 6.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative and eighty having voted in the negative with six absentees, the motion to recommit does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn until sometime.

The SPEAKER: A motion to adjourn is always in order. The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, moves that the House adjourn.

Mr. WELLMAN: I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of the motion to adjourn will

please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-two having voted in the affirmative and ninety-eight having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move what I now believe is the pending question before the House, which is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "D."

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, that House Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed, and a roll call was requested.

For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of a roll call will please rise and remain standing until counted.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, less than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is not ordered.

The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, that House Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. Brewer of Bath offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 549, L. D. 1481, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965."

Amend said Bill under the caption "MENTAL HEALTH AND CORRECTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF" by striking out from the paragraph entitled "Military and Naval Children's Home" the lines:

"Personal Services	2,506	—
All Other	1,250	—"

and inserting in place thereof the lines:

'Personal Services		
(13) 52,049	(13) 54,300	
All Other		
	18,381	18,418
Capital Expenditures		
	750	500'

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel a little awkward after such a long debate relative to cuts in the Appropriation Committee's recommendation, as this amendment goes in another direction, it would restore to the current services budget the amount needed to operate the Military and Naval Children's Home in Bath for the next biennium.

About four weeks ago the Sagadahoc delegation was informed of the possibility of these funds being deleted, and have gone on record as being opposed to this move. The Appropriations Committee has given as its reasons: 1. Cost of operation for the number of children in its care. 2. Age and condition of the building. 3. Institutional type service is outmoded and that foster home care is recommended.

Let me remind you first that we get just what we pay for. Quality of service to our children needs upgrading in this state. Let's keep what we have and not slide backward in meeting our obligations. The Children's Home has a fine record of successes from the 2,000 children who have left its doors in the past hundred years. There have been many community leaders who claim this as their home and are proud of it. We count among them school leaders, teachers, fine athletes, many boys and girls who have gone on to college and made a name for themselves there and in adminis-

trative positions later within the state and outside the state.

The building is old but has been kept in excellent condition. It does need some improvements in the way of fire protection, and I might ask why were funds requested at this time after all these years. Would it be possible that to build up costs it would be easier to tear this house down? The Committee claims that this type of institution is outmoded; that foster homes are more suitable to care for growing children. At a meeting with some of the county delegation and the Committee on Institutional Services subsequent to the notice of the closing, Dr. Fisher made the statement that there is a need for this type of institution. He did state, however, that this institution was not under his jurisdiction.

Now in relation to group care relative to unfortunate children, it is interesting to note in a recent article in a Baltimore paper, Dr. Eisenberg of the Johns-Hopkins Hospital reported a study by the Maryland Council of Child Welfare where they recommend establishing ten to twelve homes to house 400 of these type of children. In this connection, I would like to read just briefly and in part from a letter that was sent to Governor Reed on March 30, 1963, and this was sent by the President of the Maine Conference of Social Welfare, the President, Albert Robideau. And his background, he has a Masters Degree in social work and has in the past been District Supervisor of the State of Maine Division of Child Welfare, and he has this to say: "Dear Governor Reed: It has come to my attention that there is a move afoot to close the doors of the State Military and Naval Children's Home. I am sure that you are aware that this is the only state-sponsored children's home. To say that the Division of Child Welfare would be able to place these children elsewhere, as I understand it in foster homes, is a rash assumption. To my mind, the closing of the home reflects the lack of knowledge relative to the needs of children and families within the state. Many children

cannot accept foster care, and an institutional placement is a placement of choice. Where such placements are indicated, should the home be closed? This type of service will have to be purchased, possibly at greater expense, and definitely at the discretion of the vendor of the service, and this would often make for a therapeutically unsound waiting period prior to the placement. I know first-hand that the Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Child Welfare, experiences extreme difficulty in providing suitable foster homes for the children in the custody of the state at the present time."

And in conjunction with that letter, I would like to have you hear what the Chief of Police in Bath has to say relative to this closing, and in part: "On paper and strictly an economy viewpoint this may appear to be a good way to save the state some money. Please bear with me for just a little while I point out a few things that should be taken into consideration. This home over a period of many years has done a tremendous job with the children who have passed through here. Many of the children were of the problem variety from broken homes and from homes lacking affection and discipline, and I cannot recall as I write this a single failure among the many children who spent any period of time at the home." Now he goes on to say: "I am familiar with many children placed in foster homes and regret to say that I cannot make the same statement of them that I made regarding the graduates of the children's home." That is in part.

I have many more letters, including some from teachers and neighbors and a petition with over 1100 signatures, which has been presented to Senator Edmunds protesting the closing of this school. At the same time, I have had telephone calls and letters calling attention to conditions and abuses in some of our foster homes. I do not intend to be critical of all foster homes or the department involved, but by the department's own admission, adequate foster homes are hard to find. What, then, becomes of these children and where will they go?

What about those strong rumors both oral and written, of a deal going between the Division of Mental Health and Corrections as to the future use of this building? Are we being asked to close a worthwhile institution to be requested at a later date to appropriate a lot more money for a different type program?

I firmly believe that before we close a proven institution for a cost factor, we should study thoroughly and weigh carefully the services provided to the State by this home where delinquency is nil. Weigh it carefully against the rising costs of controlling and housing our delinquents from broken homes and inadequate foster homes.

It would seem to me, and we have been talking about per capita costs, and it was brought up today relative to the Stevens Training Center where the per capita cost is around \$3,200, and the Boy's Training Center \$3,500; State Reformatory for Women \$4,000; Military Naval and Children's Home approximately \$2300. I believe that we are approaching this in the wrong way. I think that as far as the Children's Home goes, I think it should be utilized to its fullest capacity. It could handle more children and I believe that some of the children that are in inadequate foster homes should be taken out and placed there, which would reduce the per capita cost considerably.

Therefore, I would move the adoption of this amendment to provide continuance of the Military and Naval Children's Home, and I would later request or put in an order requesting a study, especially in the area of inadequate foster homes available in the State of Maine. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: As a member of the Committee on Public Health for six years in previous Legislatures, I had occasion to inspect this every year, and I find that I can agree heartily with every word that the Representative from Bath has told you.

I remember back some years ago there was a bill similar to

this to do away with it, and it was looked into very seriously and it did not receive passage. In fact, it was withdrawn.

Now it is true that this Home is costing a little more than some places, but I have looked over it this time too, although not a member of that committee, and I find that there are 29 children there, and there is room for ten or eleven more, without any particular cost except for the board and room and if you had them in there, it would cut per capita cost way down as low as you could possibly hope it to be. They are doing a wonderful job, and have been doing a wonderful job. I am not going to tell you here where some of these people have gone, but it might surprise you to know the positions that they are holding today coming out of this place.

Now it is increasingly hard all the time, harder and harder, to place children in foster homes. It is hard indeed to find people who would like to take them, that are willing to take them because of the small amount of money that is being paid. The Federal Government does not enter into help with foster children, like they do with ADC. They are not getting enough money. In fact, I know some of the children in my town, foster homes are good homes, but the people can hardly afford to take care of them. In fact, the Federal Government came out in the past year whereby these people really have to pay for the school lunches themselves. In my town, it is thirty cents. You take thirty cents a day, and it cuts there — way down beyond all reason and doubt.

So, I hope that this amendment of his does prevail, and we go along with this fine place and keep producing these fine young men and women as we have been doing in the past.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: I move, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer, that we adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, moves that the House adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. Wellman of Bangor then requested a division on the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of adjournment, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to adjourn did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I concur with the remarks of the previous speakers. The Health and Institutional Services Committee visited this Home and we were really amazed at the wonderful home care that these children are getting. If this amendment is passed, I have an amendment which I will present myself.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Minsky.

Mr. MINSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I know the hour is late and all of us are anxious to attend to other business, yet I feel I must speak on this item and I am afraid it will be of somewhat greater length than I would like to talk, but I think there are facts that you must know and should know concerning this.

First of all, this is a unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. This decision was not taken lightly and not without study and not without a trip to the Home by the members of the Committee. There are certain things that you should first know.

Number one, the Military and Naval Children's Home is not an orphans' home. The figures that were given to me indicate that all but two of the children in this Home have mothers and all but

five have fathers. If this figure is not correct, then it is very close to being correct.

Secondly, the name or title of this Home is completely misleading. It is a misnomer; it is a hangover from one hundred years ago. This was started by the people of Bath as a pledge to their Civil War soldiers that, should they die in battle, there would be a home. But I think that there are not many Civil War veterans left who have children who need a home. The final decision as to who is admitted to the Home is with the supervisor of the Home, and that the child is or is not a veteran is not the deciding factor.

I would further point out to you, since comparison to other states seems to be in the vogue today, that no other state has a Home of similar nature. I would further point out to you that this institution is housed in a building approximately 150 years old. The children are living in dormitory-style on the third floor of this Home, of this wooden structure of 150 years of age. The person with whom we spoke, who had been an employee of this home for some time, told us that to her knowledge and her stay at the home, there had never been a fire drill. And part of the reason was that the last time there was a fire drill, some of the children were hurt trying to get down the fire escape. We, ourselves, the members of the committee pressed the fire alarm button in this building, this building where 29 children are housed in the third floor dormitory. The fire alarm system did not work, and they could not recall when the last time was that it worked. They did say some of the buttons located in some other places in the house will ring the bell. This house is not a safe home for 29 children. I ask you when you consider the safety of the Home, to consider the safety of the children. And what would your decision be should this Home be gutted by fire?

I would further point out to you that foster home care is the method by which we are caring for most of our children. It is the

method by which we care for almost all of the children in the state and by which almost all the states now use, to try to give them some semblance of family living and not to congregate children in an artificial situation.

I would further point out to you, that as already has been referred to, that there is to be another amendment offered to this bill. This further amendment would rename this Home. I think it was the Maine Military Naval Home for Adjustment. And so we have the proponents on one side saying these are wonderful kids to whom we need to give a nice home; but on the other side saying well, of course these kids need adjustment, and let's see that they have a place for adjustment. These are good kids—they do not need adjustment, and we don't need to rename the Home in order to find an excuse to save it. We do not have to create another half-way house to Pineland.

Now I would further point out that arrangements will be made for a meeting between the Appropriations Committee, the Health and Institutional Services Committee, the Health and Welfare Committee, the Commissioner of Health and Welfare, the Commissioner of Mental Health and the Superintendent of the School, and other citizens who will play a part in order to liquidate this home on a fair basis to the children involved.

I would further point out that there is money available for this spacing out of the program in our budget which expires on June 30, 1963, and there can be token appropriations to maintain what work must be done after that date.

I would further point out to you that the Bath Children's Home does no more than serve a local function. I have been told that only one-third of the children in the Home are from the community of Bath, and only forty per cent from Sagadahoc County. But I would further point out to you that this is only typical of the private homes that are now doing the same function in every other community. There are these homes

in Portland, they are in Lewiston, they are in West Scarborough, they are in Bangor. I called three homes. I did not know the names of any home in Portland. I got them out of the phone book. St. Louis Home in West Scarborough, one-third of the children are from Cumberland County; two-thirds are not. This is locally maintained. St. Elizabeth Home, Portland, approximately fifty per cent from Cumberland County; fifty per cent were not. Bangor Children's Home, forty-one per cent from Bangor; fifty-nine per cent who are not. These are locally maintained institutions.

I would further point out to you that only six of the children in the Bath Home are state wards, and yet eleven children in the Bangor Home are state wards. So we have used these prior facilities to greater advantage than we are even using our own home.

I would further point out to you that if proper foster homes cannot be maintained or found for these children, they can be placed in the existing private homes, the private homes that are doing the same thing as this. As I said, there are already almost twice as many of the state wards placed in the Bangor Home alone than are in the Bath Home. This can be done at far less cost.

Now let us review these costs briefly. The average child in this Home is consuming \$2340 per year of state funds. This was less I will admit than what was cited by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer. It is less than the Boys' Training Center. It is less than Stevens Institute. But this is not a correctional institute. There are no psychiatrists here; there are no prison guards here; there are no nurses here; there is no school maintained on the premises as there are in those institutions. If the gentleman from Bath wants to compare, then let him compare with other children in the same situation and the cost of maintaining these children at \$2340 is four to six times the cost of placing them in foster homes, and this is the comparison because these are like children.

But let us also assume that we cannot find foster homes and we want to place them in the private homes around the state — the private homes providing the same function. St. Michael's Home in Bangor with eighteen children, the average annual cost is \$840 per child per year. Now I will admit that the Sisters of the Home work, but their salaries are not commensurate with those of state employees, and this would reduce the cost. But \$840 is the annual maintenance.

The St. Louis Home, the annual maintenance is \$625 per child per year. The Bangor Children's Home, which does not have the advantage of Sisters, but hires people entirely from the economy and therefore can be analogous to the Bath Children's Home, and which I might add, is a very highly endowed institution that I do not think has to fret about its annual budget. The cost in this children's home with only 29 children, so we cannot say the size is what is building the price up, the cost per child per year in the Bangor Children's Home is \$1,216 a year, approximately one-half of the cost of placing them in the Bath Home. Perhaps this is why the state has placed eleven children there, and only six in Bath. And the costs which we have already mentioned to you are not the only costs, because the \$2340 which is state money does not include the amount of money they receive in gifts and donations through the year. So their cost is actually in excess of that and probably twice the cost of any of the Homes that I called.

I would further point out that if you pass this amendment and put back in the appropriations measure the approximately \$150,000, then I assure you that we will have to, in the capital construction budget, include certain items for the capital repairs of this building. Should this be defeated and then we will equally restrict from the capital construction budget, those additional costs.

It has already been mentioned that this was discussed in this legislature once before. It was, approximately ten years ago. And at that time, this Home was saved. Part of the comment was that the com-

munity of Bath would surely contribute to the maintenance of this Home, as I said it rightfully should, because it is a community function. They do provide free school, but so does Portland for the orphanages there; and Bangor for the orphanage there. So if this cannot be considered their contribution, what has their contribution been since that date in 1953? I can tell you; in 1955, they offered and paid \$50 towards the maintenance of that Home, not per child, but for the entire operation of the Home. I do not have what figures are available for 1956. In 1957, \$33; in 1958, \$29; in 1959, \$57; and in 1961, they gave their magnificent top of \$61. Since that time for each of the past years, they have paid \$25 each year.

Now we have read statements of certain public officials who evidently have a stake in this Home. I, too, if this is the way that we are to handle it, will read statements from public officials. William Hughes, Superintendent of the Boys' Home in Portland or the Boys' Training Center. "I wish to state that it is my considered opinion that the Military and Naval Children's Home is not in keeping with present day concepts of child care, and in fact, is duplication of the efforts of the Bureau of Social Welfare."

I would further point out to you that in questioning the Department of Mental Health and Corrections, the following statement was made by Dr. Bowman in the absence of Mr. Ulmer, the Commissioner and Dr. Schumacher the head of the Mental Health Department. But this statement was issued in the three names. In the names of Mr. Ulmer, Dr. Schumacher, and Dr. Bowman: "This program is no more appropriate according to present day standards regarding orphanages and the faculty definitely duplicates the efforts of the Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Child Welfare."

In conclusion, I would suggest the abandonment of this facility. And this is also the opinion of the late Commissioner, Perry D. Hayden. I repeat to you, remember the costs, \$2340 of state funds alone.

Compare this, as you will, against the costs to place them in foster homes. Answer in your mind why we could have three or four thousand children in foster placement care, and should select thirty children for an entirely different and more expensive program. And justify this to those placed in foster care in your own community. But compare the \$2340 with the cost of foster placement or, if you will, if no home can be found and they are placed in St. Elizabeth's or they are placed in the Bangor Children's Home or St. Michael's, then compare the \$2340 against the \$625 against the \$840 or the \$1216 I already mentioned. Privately maintained homes can do a more efficient job and are doing a more efficient job in this state.

I want it clearly understood that no member of the Appropriations Committee is without sympathy or without compassion or without a sense of responsibility to these children. But the members of this House have charged us with the responsibility, and it is our duty to discharge that responsibility without emotionalism but with fairness to all. This we have attempted to do, and I hope that you realize that the action that we recommend is in the best interests of the State of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the indefinite postponement of the motion made by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Drake.

Mr. DRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabor this point. I think that the gentleman from Bangor has made a very good presentation of the dollars and cents part of this activity. The only thing I would question is the fact that this really has nothing to do with — not too much to do with the cost of foster care versus the cost of the Children's Home. The one thing we should keep in mind is the fact that the Children's Home at Bath has facilities to take care of family groups. There have been many instances of anywhere from three to five children in the same family who have been able to stay together because they

could go to that facility. I think it is very important when you consider the fact that most of these children are the result of broken homes. Just as further rebuttal to the good gentleman from Bangor, I might refer to the Revised Statutes of 1954 of the State of Maine where it says that this activity is now a state institution the purpose of which is the rearing and education of the poor and neglected children of this state, preference being given to the children of soldiers and sailors of Maine who have served in the various wars in which the United States has engaged. That is not the Civil War naturally. I hope that the amendment proposed by my good friend from Bath, Mr. Brewer, will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. McGee.

Mr. MCGEE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just a short time ago, you gave your approval and commendation to the Appropriations Committee on what they have done in their work. But the very first item after that, you began to tear it to pieces. Now if you are going to be consistent, you will have to support them in this matter as well as you have in the past. So I think we should support the Appropriations Committee in that. And as for me, I don't intend to commit suicide if they stay in here without eating, and I hope that I am going to eat pretty quick and I hope that the rest of you can.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Bedard.

Mr. BEDARD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't want to prolong this thing too long, but I have some statements here from children that have been placed in foster homes, but we are dealing with orphans and the care of those children, and I think that we should consider very well their future, and here is a list that has been given to me by a woman that has done a lot of work in this, and she goes on and states several cases where the children have been abused by foster parents.

In Standish, Maine, a couple in their late fifties or early sixties. Serious drinking problem in the family. Own two children served time in Skowhegan Women's Reformatory before the ages of 18, and yet the state awarded as many as eleven children in this home at times, and state wards were still residing there.

Standish, Maine, a forced marriage of their own. The couple is middle aged and not well educated. A close personal friend of mine was placed in this home when she was twelve years old and left until she was eighteen. She was less than one hundred pounds, yet was required to go into the woods and help in cutting the wood, worked in the fields. She claims she was sexually molested by the husband all during the time that she was there. I personally saw a letter written to her. I received a letter from her while she was a tenant in the house. References were made to the past. Further propositions to set her up in an apartment in Portland were also contained in the letters. She advised me that their care were completely ignored and she was not removed from the undesirable environment.

I have got several more and they were in that manner, and I say I will not read them because it takes much of your time, but I say this, ladies and gentlemen, you are dealing with children that we are going to place them in foster homes and we should make sure that they get a home. These children come from these homes, some of them are married to some of the state officials here, and they are respectable people. Some are in the Army and the Armed Forces. I don't believe that children, brothers and sisters should be taken apart, but they should be kept together and we should not value the lives of the children by dollars. I say let's keep the Home.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would

like to go along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Minsky, in the indefinite postponement of this amendment. These are not orphans in the sense we are speaking of. He has covered the thing very well, and I cannot see going into the details over again, but I would just take this moment to remind you that here is a case where the Appropriations Committee has cut. It is fully justified in my opinion. We have done a great deal of work on it before we made the decision, and yet you will note that this House does not—a great many of this House does not agree with us. Now this is exactly what is going to happen when you recommit the budget and ask us to cut. I still say you could have ten reports and none of the ten would be acceptable to this House.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabor this any longer, other than I want to make one comment. I don't want the people in this House to believe that it's Bath's responsibility to take care of state children. Now what other legislator was up here in the past and what he promised should be no concern of mine; it should be of no concern of this body here. But when they say that these children are Bath products; they are mistaken. I will read the towns that they come from. We have from Clinton, Windham, Gardiner, Waterville, Richmond, Augusta, Rockland, Wiscasset, Poland and Bath. Now if Bath is responsible for those state wards, I think it is a misstatement. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to a few of the remarks made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Minsky, about the other amendment. He mentioned about these children being good children. Well, just because the other amendment states that it

will be an adjustment home, there are different types of adjustments. These children are moderately disturbed because of their circumstances. That is why they are in a home of this type. They get good family care here, and why should we upset them? There are brothers and sisters here, and at least 27 of them are from veterans' families and we do have an obligation to them.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Wellman of Bangor requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Minsky, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and forty having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman.

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to make this item, L. D. 1481 a special order of the day and timed at nine o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman, requests unanimous consent to make this item "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," Legislative Document 1481, a special order of the day tomorrow at nine o'clock. Is there objection?

The Chair hears objection, and the motion is not ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere.

Mr. BUSSIERE: I request a division on the motion made by Mr. Wellman.

The SPEAKER: There is no motion before the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, I now move that Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," Senate Paper 549, Legislative Document 1481, be re-committed to the Joint Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman reduce that in writing and offer it to the Chair.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, that Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," be re-committed to the Joint Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: I respectfully move that this House now adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House. We are ladies and gentlemen here, let's have decorum. There is a motion before the House to adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning. A division has been requested. All those in favor of adjournment, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five having voted in the negative, the motion to adjourn did prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Pease of Wiscasset,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.